

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 30, 2011, the Examiner rejected claims 32-37, 41-48, 50, and 51; and objected to claims 38-40, 49, and 52-53. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claims 32, 39, and 46 and cancelled claims 1-31, 37-38, 41, and 49-51. Claims 32-36, 39-48, and 52-53 are currently pending. Applicants have amended claims 32, 39, and 46 in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. These amendments are intended to or make the claims allowable. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise

Advisory Action

Without acquiescence to the suggestion in the advisory action, Applicants have cancelled claim 41 in order to eliminate the potential 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection that may be created. Applicants believe that this potential rejection is moot and respectfully request that the Examiner allow the claims.

Objections

The office action objected to claims 38-40, 49, and 52-53 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims. Applicants traverse the objection; however, in the interest of expediting prosecution Applicants have amended claim 32 to include claims 37 and 38, and amended claim 46 to include claim 49, which were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Filed Via EFS @ USPTO.gov on 4.25.11
Docket No. 1001-159

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The office action rejected claims 32-37, 41-48, and 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over FR236509 (the French Reference). Applicants traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution Applicants have amended the claims so that the claims are allowable as suggested in the Office Action. Applicants believe that the amendments overcome the rejections and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2011



Daniel P. Aleksynas
Registration No. 62,551
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215